



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

Handwritten initials: HmJ

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

09/127,676 07/31/98 BACHELDER

I C98-013

LM02/0427

RUSS WEINZIMMER
COGNEX CORPORATION
ONE VISION DRIVE
NATICK MA 01760-2059

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, P

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2772

DATE MAILED:

04/27/00

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/127,676

Applicant(s)

Bachelder et al.

Examiner

Phu K. Nguyen

Group Art Unit

2772



☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on Jul 31, 1998

☐ This action is **FINAL**.

☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire three month(s), or thirty days, whichever is longer, from the mailing date of this communication. Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. (35 U.S.C. § 133). Extensions of time may be obtained under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Disposition of Claims

☒ Claim(s) 1-10 is/are pending in the application.

Of the above, claim(s) none is/are withdrawn from consideration.

☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

☒ Claim(s) 1-10 is/are rejected.

☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction or election requirement.

Application Papers

☐ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.

☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on _____ is ☐ approved ☐ disapproved.

☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).

☐ All ☐ Some* ☐ None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been

☐ received.

☐ received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) _____.

☐ received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

*Certified copies not received: _____

☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

Attachment(s)

☐ Notice of References Cited, PTO-892

☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). _____

☐ Interview Summary, PTO-413

☒ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948

☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152

Phu K. Nguyen
PHU K. NGUYEN
PRIMARY EXAMINER
GROUP 2400

--- SEE OFFICE ACTION ON THE FOLLOWING PAGES ---

Art Unit:

1. The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because it contains the language that can be implied (e.g., "In a preferred embodiments", or "A method is disclosed"). Correction is required.

See MPEP § 608.01(b).

2. Applicant is reminded of the proper content of an abstract of the disclosure.

A patent abstract is a concise statement of the technical disclosure of the patent and should include that which is new in the art to which the invention pertains. If the patent is of a basic nature, the entire technical disclosure may be new in the art, and the abstract should be directed to the entire disclosure. If the patent is in the nature of an improvement in an old apparatus, process, product, or composition, the abstract should include the technical disclosure of the improvement. In certain patents, particularly those for compounds and compositions, wherein the process for making and/or the use thereof are not obvious, the abstract should set forth a process for making and/or use thereof. If the new technical disclosure involves modifications or alternatives, the abstract should mention by way of example the preferred modification or alternative.

The abstract should not refer to purported merits or speculative applications of the invention and should not compare the invention with the prior art.

Where applicable, the abstract should include the following:

- (1) if a machine or apparatus, its organization and operation;
- (2) if an article, its method of making;
- (3) if a chemical compound, its identity and use;
- (4) if a mixture, its ingredients;
- (5) if a process, the steps.

Extensive mechanical and design details of apparatus should not be given.

3. Applicant is reminded of the proper language and format for an abstract of the disclosure.

The abstract should be in narrative form and generally limited to a single paragraph on a separate sheet within the range of 50 to 250 words. It is important that the abstract not exceed 250 words in length since the space provided for the abstract on the computer tape used by the printer is limited. The form and legal phraseology often used in patent claims, such as "means" and "said," should be avoided. The abstract should describe the disclosure sufficiently to assist readers in deciding whether there is a need for consulting the full patent text for details.

Art Unit:

The language should be clear and concise and should not repeat information given in the title. It should avoid using phrases which can be implied, such as, "The disclosure concerns," "The disclosure defined by this invention," "The disclosure describes," etc.

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-10 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Holmes (5,497,451).

As per claim 1, Holmes teaches the claimed "method for refining a geometric description model of an object" comprising the steps of:

"Providing an image of the object" (Holmes, column 11, lines 16-18);

"Providing a rough geometric description model" (Holmes, column 11, lines 16-41);

"Extracting submodels from the rough geometric description" (Holmes, subsurfaces);

"Finding poses of the sub-models" (Holmes, column 12, lines 22-54); and

"Using the found sub-models to reconstruct a refined geometric description model"

(Holmes, column 13, lines 3-8).

It is noted that Holmes does not explicitly teach "a rough" model of the object. However, Holmes' primitive subsurfaces which will be further sub-divided into smaller subsurfaces can be regarded as a "rough" model of the surface. Thus, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to configure Holmes' system as

Art Unit:

claimed because the first decomposed subsurfaces can be represented a rough model of the surface and the further subdivided subsurfaces can be regarded as "refined" model of the surface.

Claims 2-9 add into claim 1 the details of process which Holmes teaches in columns 17-22 which shows the process of refining the object representation.

Due to the similarity of claim 10 to claim 1 it is rejected under a similar reason.

Accordingly, the claimed invention as represented does not represent a patentable distinction over the art of record.

Conclusion

3. Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington, D.C. 20231

or faxed to:

(703)-308-9051 (**formal** communications intended for entry), Or:

(703)-305-9724 (**informal** communications labeled **PROPOSED** or **DRAFT**).

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to:

Sixth Floor Receptionist, Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA.

Art Unit:


4. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Phu K. Nguyen, whose telephone number is (703)-305-9796 and can normally be reached Monday-Friday from 6:30 AM to 3 PM.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

Phu K. Nguyen

Patent Examiner

Art Unit 2772


PHU K. NGUYEN
PRIMARY EXAMINER
GROUP 2400